

Application No.: 10/812,938

Amendment dated: January 2, 2007

Reply to Office Action dated: November 1, 2007

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 7, and 9 are amended above to correct an informality. Support for the amendments is found throughout the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 to 15 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 to 15 is respectfully requested based on the foregoing amendments, and the remarks below.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kumaran, et al., U.S. Pub No. 2003/0187743 A1 (hereinafter “Kumaran”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kumaran purportedly concerns a process brokering service (PBS) for managing and integrating processes distributed among several enterprises and applications. *See, e.g.*, Kumaran at paragraphs 0002 and 0009. Kumaran refers to a system that makes the processes of various back-end systems compatible with one another. *Id.* In contrast, claim 1 of the present invention includes the limitation of “(i) defining, in configuration data of a computer system, a business process in terms of what activities the business process comprises.” As described in the specification, an example of a business process might be a loan approval process in a bank, and examples of activities might include collection of data, analysis of data, and so on. The activities of the business process are defined “with respect to a business object” and include a plurality of process control elements. Kumaran fails to teach a business object as claimed in claim 1, and therefore, also fails to teach “(ii) defining a behavior of each activity of the business process with

Application No.: 10/812,938

Amendment dated: January 2, 2007

Reply to Office Action dated: November 1, 2007

respect to a business object acted on by the business activity,” as well as the control elements of claim 1 which are all defined in relation to a business object.

The Office Action relies on the Kumaran Abstract for support. The Kumaran Abstract, however, only appears to describe managing access to information aggregated from a plurality of information systems, and *not* access to a business object. The Office Action also relies on paragraph 20 of Kumaran to describe “a plausibility check element, which verifies that the data object sufficiently meets a set of criteria to proceed past the instant activity.” However, paragraph 20 of Kumaran only appears to describe that “[t]he PBS interface redirects a business event from a client to the appropriate ADOC.” An ADOC is an adaptive document used by the PBS that “choreographs the collaboration of the various back-end systems.” *See* Kumaran paragraph 17. The ADOC is *not* an activity as recited in claim 1, but rather is a conduit between disparate back-end systems.

Similarly, page 5 of the Office Action asserts that paragraphs 13, 18, and 23 teach “a release element, which signals that the data business object is ready to proceed past the instant activity in the business process,” but these paragraphs only mention an ADOC, which is not an activity as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Kumaran. Independent claims 3, 7, and 9 contain features analogous to those of claim 1, and for essentially the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 7, and 9, also are allowable over Kumaran. The remaining claims 2, 4 to 6, 8, and 10 to 15 depend from at least one of the independent claims, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as those claims.

Application No.: 10/812,938

Amendment dated: January 2, 2007

Reply to Office Action dated: November 1, 2007

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 to 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

**Request for Allowance**

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to  
Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: January 2, 2007

By: /Jeffrey R. Joseph/  
Jeffrey R. Joseph  
(Reg. No. 54,204)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500  
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501